

# **Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

**DOI-BLM-WY-030-DNA15-181**

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

---

OFFICE: Rawlins Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-WY-030-DNA15-181

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: WYW-138670, WYW-148483

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Applications for Permit to Drill (APD) for Jack Sparrow Supplemental 1 POD: 1691 10-29, 1-33, 7-33, 10-33, and 15-33 Natural Gas Wells

LEASE NUMBER(S): WYW-138670, WYW-148483

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Township 16 North, Range 91 West, Sections 29 and 33; Carbon County, Wyoming

APPLICANT: Warren E&P Inc. (Warren)

## **A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures.**

The Proposed Action would be to construct roads, well pads, pipelines, utility corridors, and to drill five natural gas wells. The original project was approved on September 6, 2011 and was previously analyzed under the Jack Sparrow Supplemental 1 POD Environmental Assessment (EA) (WY-030-09-EA-243). The original proposal was for 7 wells; two have since been drilled. Under the new Proposed Action, Warren is still proposing to drill natural gas wells from federal surface to federal mineral. The wells are proposed as vertical wells to the Almond, Pine Ridge, and Allen Ridge coal formations.

Any additional facilities later deemed necessary would be proposed and applied for via Sundry Notice (Form 3160-5).

Water required for drilling surface casing would be obtained from Baggs Pond, and water for completing operations would be produced water brought in via pipelines and tanker trucks using existing haul roads from wells located within the Spyglass Hill Federal Unit. Any changes to the water source or method of transportation would require written approval from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Authorizing Officer (AO).

The original on-site inspection of the Jack Sparrow Supplemental 1 POD was conducted on May 15, 2009, and re-onsited on August 27 and 28, 2015. Numerous project components were analyzed and best management practices applied to reduce potential impacts to soils, vegetation, hydrology, wildlife, cultural, and paleontological resources. Migratory birds were not analyzed in the original document. Due to their presence, a project design feature

would be added to the AR 1591 10-33 well site and access road: “Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited during the period of April 10--July 10 of each year to protect neotropical and other migratory bird species and their habitats.”

Project is within 2 miles of the Pipeline and East Dad Road Leks, within General Habitat Management Area (GHMA), and near several burrowing owl nests. Therefore, project design features would be added stating that surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited from March 15 to July 14 for Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) and prohibited from April 1 to September 15 within 0.75 miles of burrowing owl nests.

The general location of the proposed natural gas wells would be approximately 27 miles northwest of Baggs, Wyoming. To access the existing well pad, beginning at Baggs, Wyoming travel northerly on State Highway 789 for 22.3 miles. Turn right at the Dad turn-off and travel northeasterly on County Road 608 for 5.9 miles to the GP Federal 13-29 access road. From here follow directions to the wells provided in the individual Applications for Permit to Drill (APDs) in the POD.

## **B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

LUP Name: Rawlins Resource Management Plan      Date Approved: December 24, 2008

This Proposed Action is subject to the Record of Decision (ROD) and Approved Rawlins Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), as amended. The Resource Management Plan was amended by *The Bureau of Land Management Casper, Kemmerer, Newcastle, Pinedale, Rawlins, and Rock Springs Field Offices Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment for Greater Sage-Grouse* (September 21, 2015). The Proposed Action is in conformance with the applicable LUP. Natural gas exploration and development are specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Minerals, page 2-20, Management Goal: “Manage mineral resources from available BLM-administered public lands and federal minerals while minimizing the impacts to the environment, public health and safety, and other resource values and uses.”

Management Objective 2: “Provide opportunities for exploration and development of conventional and unconventional oil and gas, coal, and other leasable minerals.

Page 2-21, Management Actions, Oil and Gas: “Surface disturbing activities will be intensively managed ... and will be subject to reclamation practices (Appendix 36).”

Supporting decisions protecting specific resource values can also be found in the Record of Decision for the Rawlins Resource Management Plan.

**C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.**

Jack Sparrow Supplemental 1 POD Environmental Assessment (WY-030-09 EA-0243), approved October 3, 2011.

Atlantic Rim Area Natural Gas Field Development Project Environmental Impact Statement (AREIS) and Record of Decision (ROD), approved March 23, 2007.

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

- 1. Is the new Proposed Action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The new Proposed Action essentially the same as the originally approved Jack Sparrow Supplemental 1 POD EA. The only difference would be that two of the original wells have been drilled. This project contains the remaining five locations which were not moved from where they were originally proposed.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new Proposed Action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. In reviewing the proponent's submitted proposal, the BLM IDT conducted reviews and considered known and potentially occurring resources and conditions in the project area. No new resource issues were identified which would necessitate the formulation of additional alternatives beyond those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. The original EA analyzed the Proposed Action and the No Action alternatives and the AREIS analyzed the Proposed Action, No Action, and Resource Protection alternatives.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new Proposed Action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The existing EA impact analysis is still valid. The site-specific review of potential impacts to BLM sensitive species identified that habitat exists for migratory birds. Consideration of these species was not a requirement at the time the original EA was conducted. A project design feature was added in the form of a timing stipulation for surface disturbing and disruptive activities (see Proposed Action). No change in the analysis would be expected as this timing period restriction was already analyzed for other sensitive species (GRSG) in the previous analysis.

The Upper Colorado River Basin watershed report was updated in 2011. The portion of the watershed containing this project was found to still be meeting all rangeland health standards.

**4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new Proposed Action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. Site-specific impact analysis was completed for the original EA, which analyzed the impacts of seven natural gas wells, access roads, and pipelines. The GRSG timing restriction was shortened by two weeks to be in compliance with the Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments for the Rocky Mountain Regions, Including the Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-Regions of Lewistown, North Dakota, Northwest Colorado, Wyoming and the Approved Resource Management Plans for Billings, Buffalo, Cody, HiLine, Miles City, Pompeys Pillar National Monument, South Dakota, [and] Worland. The current timing restriction would begin on March 15 instead of March 1. Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the new Proposed Action would still be similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document.

**5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. Public involvement and interagency review is still adequate for the current Proposed Action. In addition to the public involvement during the NEPA process for the original EA (30 Day public notice starting June 25, 2010), and the AREIS, the new Jack Sparrow Supplemental 1 POD project was entered onto the NEPA register on July 29, 2015. No public comments have been received. The AREIS process included opportunities for public involvement during scoping for the AREIS in May 2001, a public comment period for the AR Draft EIS in December 2005, and a public comment period for the AREIS in November 2007.

### **E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

Individual	Title	Organization
Nyle Layton	Natural Resource Specialist (NRS)	BLM
Sandra Taylor	Wildlife Biologist	BLM
T.J Murry	Rangeland Management Specialist	BLM
Natasha Keierleber	Archaeologist	BLM
Kay Nation	Legal Instruments Examiner	BLM
Megan Vasquez	Civil Engineer Technician	BLM
Mark Newman	Geologist	BLM
Andrew Kauppila	Petroleum Engineer	BLM
David Wyckoff	Realty Specialist	BLM
David Hullum	Outdoor Recreation Planner	BLM
Susan Foley	Soil Scientist	BLM
Ray Ogle	NRS-Reclamation	BLM
Ben Smith	Wild Horse & Burro Specialist	BLM
Kelly Owens	Hydrologist	BLM
Susan Foley	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	BLM
Vanessa Cameron	Regulatory Specialist	Warren E&P

Note: Refer to the EA for a complete list of the team members involved the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal (with attachments) conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the Proposed Action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nyle D Layton, Physical Scientist/ Natural Resource Specialist

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan Foley, Planning and Environmental Coordinator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dennis J. Carpenter, Field Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date